MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): May I know———

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The member has already sat down.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): He sat down because I stood up.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT; It was some time after he sat down that you got up, Mr. Elenkath.

The demand was put to vote and carried, and the grant was made.

PUBLIC WORKS.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Sir, I rise to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1 lakh, under Demand VI—Public Works, for the formation of a separate P. W. D. Division to attend to the minor irrigation works in the State.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*): I rise to a point of order, Sir. In moving for supplementary grants, it has been the practice to give us the benefit of full information regarding the circumstances necessitating the demand. I now find official members moving for supplementary grants as though they are main demands like those made at the Budget session.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The printed statement furnished to you, though brief, is lucid enough for the purpose, since it tells you that it is for the formation of a separate P. W. D. Division to attend to minor irrigation works in the State. Therefore, I think it is for you, if you want further information on the matter, to put questions to the official member in charge.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I really intended to explain———

DEPUTY PRESIDENT; Mr. Jacob will not be in order if he attempts to speak, because, after making the demand, he immediately sat down.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I sat down only since you got up, Sir.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: So far as I remember, Mr. Jacob sat down after formally moving for the grant, when Mr. Ramasubba Aiyar got up.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*): If so, his position is right, he can continue.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Whether it is right or not, it is for me to decide. If facts are different from what I thought they were, it is a different matter then I shall reconsider my ruling. I saw Mr. Jacob sitting down before Mr. Ramasubba Aiyar got up. If that be so, my position is clear.

MR. C. V. CHANDRASEKHARAN (*Deputy Director of Public Instruction*): Mr. Jacob sat down only after———

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: In this matter, Mr. Chandrasekharan, Mr. Jacob's statement is enough. (*Laughter.*)

If Mr. Jacob really intended to speak and his sitting was accidental, I have no objection to allow him to speak.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*) : May I submit for your consideration that I understood absolutely nothing of what took place between Mr. T. P. Ramasubba Aiyar and Mr. Jacob, except that something took place ?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : That depends on the mental and physical capacity of individual members.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*) : There was also a ruling from the Chair, I wish to get an idea of what took place.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : The ruling was expressed in a sufficiently loud voice.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum Rural*) : But, I did not understand, Sir.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : Yes, we will leave it at that, and proceed.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : Sir, the necessity to attend to the maintenance of irrigation works in this State has been before Government for the last sixty years and more, and year after year, allotments were being made in the budget. Unfortunately, however, Government did not receive that amount of co-operation which they were entitled to expect from the ryots, in carrying out the works and also in the upkeep of the irrigation works. Agriculturists and landowners not only failed to carry out their share of the work, but actually encroached on channel bunds and tank *porambokes* with the result that most of the irrigation works gradually deteriorated and have become, in most cases, useless. Channels have been reduced in width, tanks have become silted up and their bunds eroded, and everything has been brought down to a condition bordering on the dangerous.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*) : Does the amount now asked for represent only the salary of the officers and staff for the proposed new Division ?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : I shall come to that.

MR. PUTHUPALLI S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon II*) : May I know whether, in the budget for the current year, any funds have been allotted for minor irrigation works ?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : He will answer it later on.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : In the year 1897 the Irrigation Regulation was introduced into the State, giving the Government power to control the various irrigation works. But, unfortunately, owing to its rather cumbersome nature and the procedure laid down, it has not been found satisfactory to work as it might have been. Matters have gradually gone worse with the result that many times this matter of investigating the whole question has been brought before the Assembly and also before the Legislative Council. The result of it was that Government appointed a Committee to investigate the whole matter and submit recommendations for modifying the Regulation and suggest any other improvement which will help in bettering the existing state of affairs. This Committee consisted of officials and non-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. L. H. Jacob.]

officials and was constituted in March 1930. After touring the country and getting a considerable amount of evidence all over the State, they submitted their Report in October 1931. Amongst the Committee's recommendations was one relating to the formation of a separate Irrigation Division under the P. W. D. in charge of an Executive Engineer for attending to all the irrigation works and to get them into a better state of repair. In this proposal they suggested that there should be two Sub-Division Officers, one of them to be entirely and solely in charge of the Kuttanad area consisting of the taluks of Parur, Vaikam, Shertala, Kottayam, Changanachery, Ambalapuzha and Kartikapalli and with his headquarters at Alleppey, and the other officer to be in charge of the rest of the State with his headquarters at Trivandrum. The Committee have also defined their functions, and recommended that it should be impressed on them that they were not only P. W. D. officers but they were also Irrigation Officers and that they should go about and freely mix with the people, obtain their views and consult them with regard to the works that should be carried out. They were also expected to attend to the improvement of communications where they affected irrigation, and also investigate into the cause of the frequent flood damages, which cause such devastation in the northern parts, of Travancore. It will thus be seen that the work expected of this Division was of a very extensive nature and scope. I forgot to mention that the Committee in their proposal suggested that this Division should be formed omitting the Kodayar Project and that it should concern only with the rest of the State. I am in entire agreement with the Committee on this point and I think it will be wiser to leave the Kodayar Project out of this altogether. This is a large Project and I do not think that we should leave it to the attention of only a Sub-Division Officer with a Division Officer at Trivandrum. It is essential, I think, to have an Executive Engineer always at Nagercoil for this Division Having an Executive Engineer at Nagercoil, I would leave with him all minor irrigation works south of the Kuzhittura river. There are a few minor irrigation works going on in the Vilavankod taluk and as his jurisdiction stops there, he can continue to control them. The new Irrigation Executive Engineer, therefore, would have control of all irrigation works from the Kuzhittura river northwards up to the Cochin frontier. I cannot, however, agree altogether with the Committee's conclusions that the rest of the State could be sub-divided, if we ought to have any sort of real supervision and proper control over the quality of work and the expenditure incurred. If we agree to one Sub-Division Officer for the Kuttanad area, I leave it to you to visualise the extent of the territory which the other Sub-Division Officer will have to control. I am rather in agreement with Mr. Kuriakose, who was one of the members of the Committee, that the northern taluks of Muvattupuzha and Todupuzha should not be left to the attention of one Sub-Division Officer stationed at Trivandrum. I consider it very necessary to have a Sub-Division Officer stationed in the north with his head-quarters at Muvattupuzha or Perumbavur.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): May I know what Mr. Kuriakose has said, because the Chief Engineer stated tha the was in agreement with Mr. Kuriakose?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): He wrote a letter to the Committee suggesting that there shou'd be a third Sub-Division Officer, whereas the Committee recommended only two. He wanted that officer to have charge of the works in the northern taluks.

MR. S. CHATTANATHA KARAYALAR (*Shencotta*) What is the definite proposal of the Government?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I am coming to that.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Would you take much more time?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I want only some little time.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You have got only two minutes more.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): With regard to the Sub-Division Officers, the Committee recommended only two and my proposal is that we should have three Sub-Division Officers, one with his headquarters at Alleppey, another with his headquarters at Quilon and a third with his head quarters at Muvattupuzha or Perumbavur. This is only a matter of detail which can be considered later.

Next to the Kodayar Project, the areas which are subject to paddy cultivation are the northern taluks of Kunnatnad and Muvattupuzha which have a wet land area of 61,000 acres and 46,000 acres respectively or a total of 1,07,000 acres, as against only 53,346 acres under the Kodayar Project. So I think the members will agree with me in saying that they are entitled to have a Sub-Division Officer.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*): May I know what portion of the amount now demanded is to be spent towards salary and what portion of it is to be spent towards the project proper, that is to say, towards construction works?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Rs. 58,000 will go towards works, and Rs. 42,000 towards establishment. The recommendation of the——

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*) Sir, may I know -

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let him at least finish his sentence before you question him. He was just in the middle of a sentence.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): I thought he had finished his sentence,

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Now that Mr. Jacob has been interrupted in the middle of a sentence and does not seem to proceed, you may put your question.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): Sir, may I know whether it is the intention of Government to make suitable amendments to the existing Irrigation Regulation?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Let me finish my speech. The recommendation of the Committee was to make an annual allotment of Rs. 5 lakhs towards these works. It was of course not possible

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. L. H. Jacob].

to raise the expenditure to that figure. Further there was the preliminary work to be gone through in forming a new Division. It will take some time for us to prepare regular schemes for expenditure. That is why for this year we are only asking for, an instalment of Rs. 1 lakh. The formation of an Irrigation Board and the amendment to the Irrigation Regulation will be considered later. The amendment to the Regulation will be possibly taken up after the Irrigation Executive Engineer has had the time to study all its aspects. I hope the House will accept the grant.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*) : May I know whether this scheme will have any adverse effect upon the extension or supplementing of the Kodayar Project of irrigation ?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : No, it has nothing to do with the Kodayar Project.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*) : Sir, my question was whether this scheme providing for minor irrigation will have any adverse effect on the Kodayar system of irrigation.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : No.

MR M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*) : May I know from the member whether under this scheme the abolished Sub-Division in the Kodayar Project Division will be restored in as much as the minor irrigation works under the Project have also been brought under the Divisional Officer at Nagercoil ?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : I have explained that all the works south of the Kuzhittura river will remain with the Executive Engineer at Nagercoil and it is only proposed that the new officer will have control of works from the Kuzhittura river northward up to the boundary.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : May I know from the member whether Government have any objection in having the minor irrigation works placed under the control of the Land Revenue Commissioner instead of under the Public Works Department ?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : The whole scheme is that minor irrigation should be under the P. W. D.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : I want to know whether Government have any objection to transferring the control to the Land Revenue Commissioner.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : There is no proposal like that or allied to that before the House.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : That would be quite impracticable.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : May I know whether new officers are to be appointed for this work ?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : Being a new Division, new officers will be appointed.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : Are there not qualified Sub-Division Officers now in the Department ?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): If the officers already in the department are to be taken, their posts will have to go to new men in any event.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Is it not possible to reduce the expenditure on account of salary by appointing the officers already in service for this section?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): No, I am afraid, not.

(Mr. Ramakrishna Panickar and Mr. Thanu Pillai both stood up to ask questions.)

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR (*Kartikapalli II*): May I know from the member the proportion obtaining in the P. W. D. between the cost of the staff and the cost on works?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Sir, I have already sat down.

MR. C. V. CHANDRASEKHARAN (*Deputy Director of Public Instruction*): Sir, on a point of order, Sir, can two members be standing at the same time?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The real difficulty will arise only if two members stand and speak at the same time. Two or twenty members may stand but cannot speak at the same time.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): May I know whether members who are not speaking should stand in their seat?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: After all I do not think this matter is a very important one.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Am I to understand that the Government member has resumed his seat?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That is what I understood.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): Sir, I stood up to put a question to Mr. Jacob, but, because Mr. Ramakrishna Panickar also stood up, I sat down.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I do not think we need adjudicate upon those points. For the present, let us take it that Mr. Jacob has sat down.

MR. M. N. NAIR (*Kottayam I*): Sir, I rise to support the motion. In my budget speech I raised two points, namely, one about flood damages in Kuttanad and the other that the department itself is doing some harm to minor irrigation. I am glad to hear from the member that one Sub-Division Officer is to be appointed for the Kuttanad area with headquarters at Alleppey. In this connection, I would like to remind this House that during the budget speech I was supported by one member, who is no less than the Deputy President himself, in my statement that Kuttanad is in need of drainage while South Travancore is in need of irrigation. I do not know whether the funds now allotted are enough for such work. The Kuttanad flood damages cannot easily be prevented. I think an able officer will have to be deputed to investigate how best the flood damages that are usually occurring in Kuttanad and that do harm especially to the reclaimed portion of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. N. Nair.]

Vembanad Kayal could be put down. Anyhow it is a good sign that special attention is going to be paid to the matter. I want to say that a special bund which was put up by the department on the Ettumanur Punnathara road is doing great harm to the sugar-cane and paddy cultivation in that locality. After making my budget speech, I went and enquired of the Kottayam Engineer whether any attention was being paid to that matter. I was glad to hear from the authorities concerned that they have enquired into the matter and found that the grievances were true. But I think the grievances have not completely been remedied yet. I hope these works will be attended to. I therefore gladly support the motion before the House.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): Sir, so far as the sum of Rs. 58,000 out of the one lakh asked for is concerned I am in entire agreement with the Chief Engineer, nay, I want to see that a much larger sum is allotted for the purpose of minor irrigation. But when I come to the remaining sum of Rs. 42,000 that is now asked for, for the pay of officers, I have my own doubts as to how far I can agree with the Chief Engineer, especially in view of the fact that we have not been given the necessary information. Sir, I may bring to the notice of the House the fact that, in the year 1106, when the budget for the P. W. D. was for Rs. 40 lakhs, the amount under establishment was about Rs. 5½ lakhs. That works out at thirteen per cent. Now we find that we have provision for only about Rs. 30 lakhs under P. W. D., out of which, Rs. 1,29,000 is for protective irrigation which will be brought under the new Division. So what is left with the P. W. D. exclusive of irrigation, is only about Rs. 29 lakhs. This year the cost under establishment is Rs. 5·14 lakhs, that is almost the same as it was in the year 1106 when the total expenditure was over Rs. 40 lakhs. Now Rs. 42,000 is required for paying the additional staff. I am at a loss to see why it is not possible to divert that amount out of the 5·14 lakhs, or to take away the necessary officers from the general P. W. D. and put them to this work. That is the question which I want the Chief Engineer to answer before I can make up my mind one way or the other. I should not be taken as in any way objecting to the allotment for minor irrigation. I am one who has been pleading for that. But that should not blind me to the requirements of the situation. To me, it appears that it should be quite easy for the Chief Engineer to divert forty-two thousand rupees from the amount already allotted for P. W. D. establishment or to divert the necessary number of officers from the existing P. W. D. staff to the newly proposed Division. The Retrenchment Committee made certain recommendations all of which have not been given effect to. The additional work is going to be done by the P. W. D. and the additional amount provided for work during the current year is only about half a lakh. But when we say that this half a lakh of rupees should be profitably and well spent, the Chief Engineer wants Rs. 42,000 more under establishment. Is it anything that can be heeded to in this House? I think not.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

I see from the budget that there are a number of officers in the cadre of Supervisors, Overseers, and Assistant Engineers who have been made supernumeraries because of some of the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee being given effect to. I wish to know whether the Chief Engineer has taken into consideration that fact and whether he has made provision for absorbing the supernumerary officers in the proposed Division and whether this sum of Rs. 42,000 is over and above that. Then again this year he proposes to spend only the provision already made in the budget *plus* Rs. 58,000, that is, Rs. 2·21 lakhs in all. Out of this, some amount would have been spent already. For this purpose he wants officers whose pay is Rs. 42,000. I am at a loss to understand the propriety of the demand. That should have been clearly explained by the Chief Engineer. I hope the Chief Engineer will give us the necessary information before we are called upon to vote.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): Sir, I rise to move a token cut of Re. 1 from the demand.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Have you given notice of the token motion?

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): I was informed that the token motion can be moved in this House.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): It has not been the practice in the Travancore Legislative Chamber to move token cuts on supplementary demands. There has been no precedent at all for such motions. And that is based on very good reasons. When the whole demand is submitted for vote, it is not necessary to move a token cut.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I want to ask a question of the Law Member.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: He is only explaining a point of law.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): He is making a speech.

Article 177 of the Legislative Assembly Manual says: "Supplementary or additional demands shall be dealt with by the Assembly and the Council in the same way as if they were demands for grants."

When it is a demand for grant, we are entitled to move for a reduction of Re. 1 or Rs. 100 or oppose the demand as a whole. It is said that when a new need arises the Government could bring in a supplementary demand. Should we not be allowed to reduce that amount or any other sum which we think should be reduced? I think that the rules of the Travancore Legislature do not in any way prohibit such motions. Strictly speaking the Law Member could not cite any precedent because this is the Sri Mulam Assembly and this is the first time that a supplementary demand is made.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): I am putting a question to Mr. Asan.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Asan, have you given notice of the motion?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Vaccikara*): It is impossible to give notice, because the Assembly office is not giving the demands in sufficient time. We got the revised list only on the day on which the Assembly met and this list is revised very often. We do not know whether it will not be revised again.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It is incidental to Government business. But have you given notice under the law?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I have given notice to the President.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): Has not the Chair a discretion in the matter of notice?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Let me hear the Law Member.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): As regards Mr. Asan's point, namely, that he has a right to move for the reduction of any figure out of the grant submitted for vote, I quite agree with him. But the speech on that motion must be directed to show specifically why and how that reduction should and could be made; and that motion is not strictly a token motion. In token motions, you make the motion under one headand direct your speech to matters not strictly or directly covered by the grant submitted for vote. By an accepted practice or convention, such motions are allowed during the annual budget debate. They are considered relevant then, as the entire department is then thrown open. That is not so in the case of supplementary demands. Here, the motions must be strictly relevant and in the debate on the demand you cannot bring in the policy under debate except to the extent that arises strictly within the ambit of the demand made. So, token motions, as they are understood, do not arise; and if the motion is only for discussing the policy directly underlying the demand, you do not want a token motion.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): May I know, what is the rule, on which the Law Member relies, that a token motion should not be moved under a supplementary grant?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): It is nowhere stated in the Rules that a token motion as such can be moved either under the annual budget or under a supplementary demand.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): But the rule I quote is self-explanatory.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): What is the rule?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Rule 176, sub-section 8 of the Assembly Manual.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Does that rule or the rule for the annual budget specifically say that a token cut may be moved?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*): Under Standing Orders 59 of the Sri Mulam Assembly, notice of a motion to omit or reduce any grant has to be given two clear days before the day on which the demand is to be considered. I do not know whether—

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Cannot Rule 170, section (3) of the Assembly Manual, be applied for the present discussion?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): May be. But nothing is said there or anywhere else what reduction motions are relevant and could be made. That is why I said, it is all a question of relevancy. I do not say that any particular amount cannot be reduced when supplementary demands are moved. If you want that, you must suggest the means how and the reasons why it should be reduced. There must be real relation between the amount and the reason. The procedure of token motions is not specifically provided for anywhere in the Rules. Token motions are considered relevant in the annual budget debates because then the whole policy is considered to have been thrown open but not at supplementary demands which are made for a specific need and a specific need alone.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): For that matter, I will propose reduction of one rupee in the total grant of one lakh of rupees, for the purpose of discussing the policy of the department.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): No; not of the department. If it is for discussing the policy underlying this demand, no token motion is necessary. In fact it is meaningless. That policy is open to discussion even otherwise.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): May I know whether what Mr. Asan quoted is not the rule with regard to the budget grant?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes. That is the very reason why I say that at present token motions are irrelevant. It is a question of relevancy.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): Cannot policy be discussed under the whole demand?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes. When the entire departmental budget is placed as in the annual budget, but not when a specific need alone is brought up as at present.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur* cum *Pattanapuram*): What is the rule that the Law Member now wants?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Under supplementary demand, reduction motions are only economy motions. Under an economy motion, general policy cannot be discussed. That is my point.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*): What is the rule relied upon by the Standing Orders for moving token motions?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Members put questions on legal matters of procedure covered by the Rules. When the Law Member is explaining, please, do not interrupt him.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): There is no specific rule at all dealing with token motions. It is always a question of relevancy.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): ഈ വിഷയത്തെ പ്പററി നിയമാനുസരണമായി വേണ്ട സമയത്തുതന്നെ ഞാൻ നോട്ടീസ് കൊടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ മററു കാപ്പികൾപോലെ അതിന്റെ കാപ്പികൾ ഞങ്ങൾക്ക് കിട്ടിയിട്ടില്ല. അതിന്റെ കാരണം എന്താണെന്ന് പറയേണ്ടതാണ്.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have before me a copy of the motions supplied from the office. Under the Rules, these need not be printed. As to whether Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai's motion should be allowed or not, depends on other considerations. Those who wish to speak on the admissibility of token motions under this grant can do so.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kulkulam I*): I am going to oppose the motion, in case my token motion is not allowed.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You cannot make a provisional opposition so far as I am able to see from the facts placed before me and also from the interpretation of Rules.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur cum Pattanapuram*): If the Chair is going to give a ruling on this subject, I think this is a point for further discussion.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The member may speak.

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur cum Pattanapuram*): It appears to me that the Law Member's interpretation of the Rules cannot be supported. So far as supplementary grants are concerned, whether token motions are admissible depends upon the construction of Rule 176, article (3) of the Manual. That Rule says "Supplementary or additional estimates shall be dealt with by the Assembly and Council in the same way as if they were demands for grants". So, this supplementary grant may be treated for the purpose of discussion as a regular budget grant. If therefore a token motion is admissible in the case of demands for grants, such motions are admissible in regard to supplementary estimates as well. Whether it is by convention or otherwise, the usual practice for discussing the policy of the department during budget demands for grants is to make token motions upon the particular demand. That has been established by precedent and is not denied by the Law Member. What we have to see is what the procedure now is with regard to demands for grants, and at present if a token motion is admissible in regard to demands for grants, it is equally admissible in respect of supplementary grants also. In other words, if, according to Rules and precedents, token motions are admissible in regard to demands

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for grants, the same procedure must be applied to supplementary grants also. So, it will be quite wrong to disallow a token motion on the ground, either that there is no specific rule in regard to it or that it has been established by convention. Further, what the Law Member said was that we can discuss the policy of the department under this grant itself, without moving a token motion. That being the case, I fail to see why we should not move a token motion on it.

Another difficulty also will arise if a token motion is not permitted. It may be, we may not want to throw out the whole demand but wish merely to discuss a question of policy and press it to a division. In that case, if the policy is discussed on the whole demand, we shall be forced to throw out the whole demand which is not our intention. That is a serious matter. If a token motion is permitted, we can enter our protest against the policy which is disapproved by a successful vote on it while the demand itself may be granted.

Without saying what exactly the objection is and how forcible it is, the argument of the Law Member will not avail. Therefore, it appears to me, whatever practice and rules obtain in regard to regular budget demands for grants equally apply to supplementary grants also.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*) : If a token motion is moved for drawing attention to a specific matter, can topics other than the specified one be discussed under a supplementary grant ?

MR. CHANGANACHERY K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Kunnattur cum-Pattanapuram*) : I wish to know what is the difficulty of the Law Member.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : This kind of question cannot be answered. What Mr. Changanachery Paramesvaran Pillai says on questions of law is not binding upon the House. There may be considerable value attached to that. But if you elicit information, that will be only Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai's opinion. So, I do not think that question need be answered.

MR M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*) : I agree with the Law Member in holding that a token motion does not lie in a supplementary grant. To understand the point, I will point out the difference between a supplementary demand and a demand during budget time.

A supplementary demand could be made only under two conditions. The first is,

> "The amount voted in the budget or a grant for which the vote of the Legislature is necessary is found to be insufficient for the purpose of the current year."

The second is,

> "A need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Legislature is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the budget that year."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. Sivatanu Pillai.]

To meet the circumstances that exist under these two conditions only, a supplementary grant can be made. The question here is, by moving a supplementary demand, firstly whether the policy which was adopted at the budget session could be extended, that is to say, with reference to the insufficiency of provision for a particular demand already granted. Secondly, unforeseen circumstances necessitating a demand for a supplementary grant is a new policy or issue and as such in a demand like this, there may not be two distinct issues or aspects.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): May I know how the interpretation of these rules becomes relevant in the question before the House, namely, whether token motions can be allowed?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The Chair is entitled to the benefit of the opinions of the members.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): So to put it briefly, a supplementary grant contemplates two circumstances. One is a policy which has been already accepted at the time of the budget and the second is a policy which has become new, surprising as it is, because of unforeseen circumstances. Here in this particular demand, the whole policy of the minor irrigation department is in issue. As such, as the Law Member elicited from the interrogatories, the point could be argued in two ways.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Is the member aware that the provision is only for the separate formation of the irrigation department under the P. W. D?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Of course, it comes under the P. W. Department. It has a reference to the question of policy of providing separately for minor irrigation and as such it is only a single policy or issue and so no token motion could lie here. We have to understand that token motions admit of different points of view. Such being the case, a token cut in a supplementary demand (covering only one issue or point of view) cannot lie.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*): I support Mr. Changanachery Parameswaran Pillai's point of view. Section 176, article (3) reads that supplementary or additional estimates shall be dealt with by the Assembly in the same way as if they were demands for grants. For argument's sake, assume that this was a grant brought at the budget. We could then have moved a token cut and argued on it. If that position is granted, the same thing could be done even now. If this demand had been moved when the budget is presented, it is quite competent for us to move a cut motion and argue on it. That right is not in any way to be deprived, simply because it is a supplementary grant. There is no meaning in quoting clauses (*a*) and (*b*) of Rule 176 of the Manual. They only say when a supplementary grant can be moved.

Secondly, there is no meaning in quoting precedents. This matter is *res integra* so far as we are concerned. In fact, the Sri Mulam Assembly was constituted for the first time last year and this is a supplementary grant that has first arisen. What the practice in previous Councils was is not the question at issue.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Any sort of interpretation which deprives this Assembly of its rights to move a token motion should not be granted.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha I*) : Sir, since a matter of procedure is involved in the discussion, I also wish to offer a few observations upon the point under discussion. So far as I can make out, I think there was no room for discussion, for, according to the learned law Member, even without the token motion in question, any question may be discussed when a supplementary grant is brought out. If without a token motion the policy underlying a supplementary grant is liable to be discussed, how can such right be minimised by the introduction of a token motion for discussion on that particular motion. That is exactly what I fail to understand. Therefore the contention of the learned Law Member that no token motion can be introduced in the discussion of the supplementary grant is untenable. As for the other question, apart from what the Law member is prepared to concede by way of argument upon the intrinsic interpretation of the rule contained in the Manual, that is quite clear to this extent. That is to say Rule 176 on page 51, sub-clause 3 says—

> "Supplementary or additional estimates shall be dealt with by the Assembly and the Council in the same way as if they were demands for grants."

No doubt, one thing is clear from the wording of that sub clause that supplementary grants are not identical with demands for grants. The expression "as if" clearly implies that aspect of the matter. But so far as the handling of the supplementary grant is concerned, it should be dealt with as if they are demands for grants; and turning to that aspect of question, that is the question of demands for grants, we see on page 49, Rules 167, 168, 169 and 170 which cluster round the question of demand for grants. With respect to the budget it is stated that there would be a general discussion followed by a voting for grants. If it is with respect to the latter portion alone that the supplementary grants are being elevated to the position of the budget, there should have been a general discussion upon the supplementary grant also. But that is not so provided. It is only with respect to the voting on grants that the parallelism between supplementary grants and demands is introduced. So what particular procedure is adopted in the matter of voting upon demands will have to be followed in voting upon grants also. It is only a question of procedure. It will have to be followed in the matter of supplementary grants also. If at the time of voting of a grant, token motions are admissible, I cannot really understand why they need not be admissible at the stage of supplementary grants. The learned Law Member himself says that even without the assistance of a token motion we can discuss it. The introduction of a token motion is out of place.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Does the member know the procedure of the Indian Legislative Assembly?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha I*): I do not know, I admit. The matter has to be interpreted according to the rules as they stand.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Torala*): May I know whether a motion under the token cut could admit of a discussion with regard to repairing of roads, communications, and channels as it is expected in a discussion of a demand for grant?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): The previous Council has been allowing even that.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am really thankful to both sides of this House for the argument on this question and I am particularly glad because opinions have emanated from eminent lawyers who happen to be members of the House. I have bestowed sufficient attention on this point and have listened to the various arguments with care. So far as the point raised by the learned Law Member is concerned, he made a distinction between an extension grant and a grant which is relating to a question of policy. It was conceded by the Law Member that even in opposing a motion for grant the whole policy may be discussed. Rule 176 sub-clause 3 says—

> "Supplementary or additional estimates shall be dealt with by the Assembly and the Council in the same way as if they were demands for grants"

There is distinction between substantive law and adjective law. In this case it is all a case of procedure, that is adjective law. So if one part of the procedure is applicable for motions for supplementary grants, it follows that other provisions of the law must equally apply. And unless we have got certain forms, the discussion would not be conducted in a proper manner or in a useful measure. I think therefore the wording of sub-section 3 of clause 176 being explicit and as it is provided that these questions shall be dealt with in the same way as if they were demands for grants without any reservation, I rule that a token motion will be quite in order (*Hear, Hear.*) And with regard to the other point as to notice, in the special circumstances referred to by Mr. Velayudhan Pillai, I am for excusing any irregularity and allowing the motion. Mr. Velayudhan Pillai may therefore make his motion.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): Sir, I was speaking—

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Have you got a motion?

MR. K. R ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): Yes.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: But Mr. Velayudhan Pillai's case stands on a better footing. So Mr. Velayudhan Pillai will move.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla III*): സർ, ഈ സംസ്ഥാനത്തുള്ള മൈനർ ഇറിഗേഷൻ ജോലികൾ നിർവ്വഹിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശത്തോടുകൂടി സൃഷ്ടിക്കുന്ന പ്രത്യേക പൊതുമരാമത്തു ഡിവിഷന്റെ അവശ്യാർത്ഥം ഒരു ലക്ഷം രൂപാ അനുവദിയ്ക്കണമെന്ന് അഭ്യർത്ഥിച്ചു കൊണ്ടു ഈ സഭയുടെ അംഗീകരണത്തിനു സമർപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ഡിമാൻഡിൽനിന്നു ഒരു രൂപാ കുറവു ചെയ്യണമെന്നുള്ള ഉപക്ഷേപം ഞാൻ അവതരിപ്പിക്കുകയാണു. ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം അവതരിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിന് എന്നെ പ്രേരിപ്പിച്ച സർവ്വപ്രധാനമായ സംഗതി ജനസേവന വിഷയമായ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

സംഗതികളിൽ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറധികാരികൾ പ്രദർശിപ്പിച്ച വരുന്ന അക്ഷന്തവ്യമായ അനാസ്ഥയേയും ഉത്തരവാദിത്വരാഹിത്യത്തെയും തൻ മൂലം പൊതുജനങ്ങൾക്കുണ്ടാകുന്ന കഷ്ടനഷ്ടങ്ങളെയും ഈ സഭയുടെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽ വിഷയമാക്കണമെന്നുള്ള യഥാർത്ഥമായ ഉൽക്കണ്ഠമാത്രമാണ്. ഇതിലേയ്ക്ക് ഗവണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നും സദുദ്ദേശപൂർവ്വം എത്ര സംഖ്യ അനുവദിച്ചാലും ആ വക ജോലികൾ നടത്തുന്നതിനായി നിയുക്തരാകുന്ന ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ അതിന് വേണ്ടവിധം നിർവ്വഹിക്കാത്തപക്ഷം ഉദ്ദിഷ്ട ഫലപ്രാപ്തിയ്ക്ക് പ്രായേണ വിഘാതം നേരിടുമെന്നുള്ളതു് അവിതർക്കിതമാണ്. സംസ്ഥാനത്തിൻെറ നാനാഭാഗങ്ങളിലുമുള്ള ജലസേചന ജോലികളുടെ താരതമ്യേനയുള്ള അത്യാവശ്യകത മനസ്സിലാക്കി പ്രവർത്തിക്കുന്നതിന് നിശ്ചിതമായ ഒരു കമ്മപദ്ധതി രൂപവൽക്കരിയ്ക്കുകയും തദനുസാരം പ്രവർത്തനം നടത്തുകയും ചെയ്യേണ്ടതു് അത്യന്താപേക്ഷിതമായിട്ടുള്ളതാകുന്നു. മുൻപുണ്ടായിരുന്ന റോഡുബോർഡു പോലെ ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ എല്ലാ താലൂക്കുകളിലേയും ജനപ്രതിനിധികൾ അടങ്ങിയ ഒരു ഇറിഗേഷൻ ബോർഡ് രൂപീകരിച്ച് ആബോർഡിൻെറ ഉപദേശാനുസരണം അത്യാവശ്യകതയുടെ ഗുരുലഘുത്വം പരിഗണിച്ച് പ്രാദേശികമായ കാര്യങ്ങൾ കാലവിളംബമെന്യേ നിർവ്വഹിക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം അതുതന്നെ പൊതുജനങ്ങൾക്ക് കൂടുതൽ പ്രയോജനകരമായിരിക്കുന്നതാണ്. ഈ സംഗതി ജനപ്രതിനിധികൾ ഇതിനു മുൻപു പലേ പ്രാവശ്യവും ഗവണ്മെൻറിൻെറ ദൃഷ്ടിയിൽ പതിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിലും അതർഹിക്കുന്ന വിധത്തിലുള്ള ശ്രദ്ധപതിപ്പിച്ചു കാണായ്കയാൽ വീണ്ടും നിർബന്ധപൂർവ്വം ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നതാണെന്നുകൂടി പ്രസ്താവിച്ചു കൊള്ളട്ടെ. വല്ലകാരണവശാലും ഒരു ഇറിഗേഷൻ ബോർഡ് രൂപവൽകരിക്കുന്നതിനു പ്രതിബന്ധമുള്ളതായി ഗവണ്മെൻറു കരുതുന്ന പക്ഷം ഓരോ താലൂക്കുകളിലും ജലസേചനജോലികൾ ആരംഭിക്കുന്നതിനു മുൻപായി അതാതു നിയോജകമണ്ഡലങ്ങളിലുള്ള ജനപ്രതിനിധികളുമായി ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെൻറധികൃതന്മാർ മുൻകൂട്ടി ആലോചന നടത്തിയതിനു മേൽ എന്തു ജോലിയാണ് പ്രഥമമായി നടത്തേണ്ടതെന്ന് നിശ്ചയിക്കുവാനുള്ളതും അതിനെ തുടർന്ന് അതാതു പ്രദേശങ്ങളിലെ ജലസേചനജോലികൾ നിർവ്വഹിക്കാനുള്ളതും ആണെന്നു ഞാൻ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനെ സാദരം ഉൽബോധിപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): In supporting Mr. Velayudhan Pillai's motion, I bring to the kind notice of Government that, although an Irrigation Division is essential, in the working of it certain aspects have to be considered. Far from opposing any principle

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. R. Elenkath.]

involved in it, I should think that the necessity of forming a separate Division for irrigation work has been felt for long and representations have been made in the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly, and if I am correct, on the floor of the Legislative Council, and it has been but proper that at least a suggestion has been brought by the Government to this House. The Chief Engineer told us that he is going to accept the recommendations of the Minor Irrigation Committee as they are. Regarding this, I have only to say that I find no reason why the Kodayar Project Division should be excluded from the jurisdiction of the Irrigation Division. In that case I should like to know from the Government member whether the present Division Officer who is at Nagercoil, is made free from all other works, I mean non-irrigation works. I may bring to the notice of Government that it was last year that one Sub-Division in the Southern Division was taken away and many of the maistries working in that Division were dispensed with. In this respect, I doubt whether the present staff will be able to cope satisfactorily with the non-irrigation works in South Travancore. As my friend, Mr. Pattam Thanu Pillai, pointed out, the proposal for the salaries and allowances of officers come to 42 per cent. of the grant proposed. I strongly object to it and I am of opinion that at least a large percentage, say 75 per cent. of it should go for the construction of new works. I may bring to the notice of the Chief Engineer that in South Travancore there are many tanks which have been converted into *maidans*. It would but be proper to place the whole State under an Irrigation officer, so that that branch of the P. W. D. work may be efficiently carried out.

If this Irrigation Division is not going to benefit South Travancore in any way, I would strongly protest against its formation. It will be but proper that the irrigation of the whole State is brought under the control and supervision of a special Division Officer. It would facilitate the work both from the point of view of the public as well as of officers in the execution of the work at the proper time and in the most efficient manner. In bringing these points to the notice of the Government, I support the token motion of Mr. Velayudhan Pillai.

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR (*Karikapalli II*): Sir, I support the motion. It will be admitted on all hands that the department which is to be newly organised is one which will—

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, I rise to a point of order. We are now discussing the token cut.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Are you opposing the token motion, Mr. Ramakrishna Panickar?

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR (*Karikapallai II*): I am supporting the motion.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It is the token cut that is being considered now.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR (*Kartikapallai II*): I am only supporting the motion.

MR. R. SAMBASIVA AIYAR (*Kunnatnad II*): Sir, I rise to oppose the token motion and I support the motion for the grant in its entirety. I would propose the creation of three separate Divisions in Travancore with their centres, one at Perumpavoor to represent North Travancore, another at Alleppey and the third at Trivandrum. I think that is a good proposal. The proposal to spend Rs. 58,000 for the construction of the works proper as compared with Rs. 42,000 by way of salaries to officers for the new Division is not at all objectionable as some may seem to think. What we require is attention to the works at the proper time. If only proper attention was given to existing works so that slight repairs may have been attended to at the proper time, much damage could have been prevented. Speaking about minor irrigation works in North Travancore about some of which I have personal knowledge, during the last flood the Periyar caused small breaches in various places. These breaches were left uncared for and gradually they became bigger and bigger and the whole portion became silted up. So what is necessary is the bestowal of greater attention at the proper time and if such attention is paid there will be necessity in few cases for undertaking fresh works in connection with minor irrigation. Moreover it is wrong to discourage the Engineering Department at this time when, for the first time, it has come forward with a proposal which we all desire and in order to give sufficient enthusiasm to the department I support the motion and oppose the token cut.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): May I know whether we are discussing the general motion or the token cut?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have made it very clear that we are discussing the token cut.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): May I know whether additional token cuts may be brought?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: We are at one token motion now. I am not prepared to give any legal advice as to whether more token cuts may hereafter be brought or not.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Sir, the Chief Engineer thought it fit to reject South Travancore from this scheme of minor irrigation. He was endeavouring in his speech to show that Kodayar being a major Irrigation Division it was not proposed to bring that under this scheme. I fully admit the force of that argument. But I do not understand why immediate attention should not be paid with regard to those places outside the commanded area. Some years ago Government thought it fit to institute a Minor Irrigation Section in South Travancore for the purpose of restoring the utility of those tank-beds by the side of the Aramboly frontier. For about six months that Section was working and subsequently it was dissolved. I do not know

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. Sivatanu Pillai.]

the reason for doing so. There are ever so many tank-beds beyond the Kuzhitturu river which lie barren and which if properly attended to could be utilised to irrigate, and thus great benefit brought to the people. I would bring to the attention of the Chief Engineer the necessity for bringing those places outside the commanded area also under this system. I would like to have a definite answer to this point from the Chief Engineer in the course of his reply.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): I rise to a point of order. Can a member bring local needs to the attention of the House in discussing a token cut like this?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The member ought to have raised that point when Mr. Sivatanu Pillai was speaking. That question does not arise at this stage.

MR. EDAVANATT S. PADMANABHA MENON (*Shertala I*): Sir, I rise to support the token motion in the sense that I would like to have an assurance from the Chief Engineer that there would be some Committee from this House or an independent Irrigation Board composed, of the representatives of each Division so that the officers residing in each Division may be in intimate touch with the local conditions. Especially in North Travancore there is constant visit of floods and people are afraid that the formation of big schemes, like the Cochin Harbour works, are partly responsible for these floods. Because of these heavy floods and the neglect of minor irrigation works it cannot be denied that the people are put to much loss of a serious nature. So I think that if some local committee or a committee composed of the members of this House is formed, it will bring to the official's notice the needs of each locality, and thereby much harm could be prevented. These dangers can be foreseen in time and they can, if proper attention is bestowed, be prevented. If remedies are to be resorted to after the mischief has already been done, it may not after all be worth while. If the Chief Engineer is prepared to accept this suggestion, I think the present proposal will have our entire support.

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara I*): Sir, I support the cut motion. It is a very long time since the public of Travancore began to agitate for greater attention being paid and better arrangements being made by Government for the investigation and execution of irrigation works in the State. No doubt, in deference to the wishes of the people as expressed by a motion for the adjournment of this House brought forward by myself some time back, the Govenment appointed an Irrigation Committee which concluded its enquiry by making a number of usefull recommendations. Now it is about two years or more since the Report of that Committee has been submitted to Government and still Government have not seen their way to coming to a final decision on the several recommendations made by the Committee. Now the Government come forward with a proposal to set up a separate department of irrigation. Speaking for myself, I am not against such a proposal. But I am surprised to find that the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government have come forward with a proposal which involves the expenditure of a huge sum of money, a good portion of which goes to maintain a large staff. Now one of the main recommendations of the Minor Irrigation Committee is that a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs should be set apart for irrigation purposes each year. Mr. Jacob in reply to a question put by one of my friends said that that suggestion has not been considered and no final decision arrived at by Government on the same. Now I ask what is the use of setting up a separate department of irrigation without allotting sufficient funds for irrigation works. Therefore the point that I bring to the consideration of the Government is that along with setting up a separate agency the Government must at once allot sufficient funds for works. No time should be lost in accepting the recommendation of the Committee for setting apart Rs. 5 lakhs every year for minor irrigation.

Another point that I want to bring to the notice of the House is that, in the formation of the Special Division contemplated in the new scheme, sufficient importance has not been given to South Travancore. I speak with special reference to my taluk. Till some time back there was a Special Division for Neyyattinkara. I think Mr. Jacob will not deny the fact that when he thinks of minor irrigation, Neyyattinkara must come into prominence before his eyes. I therefore request Mr. Jacob and Government to consider the necessity of establishing a separate Sub-division for the Neyyattinkara taluk.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pathanamtitta*): Sir, I move that the question be now put.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Sir, I am sorry I was not able to explain fully all the points raised by various members at the short time at my disposal. I think there has been some misunderstanding with regard to the scheme. The whole staff that I am now asking for is not intended solely to attend to irrigation matters. In the reorganisation of 1098, a reduction of staff was effected. Before 1098, we had one Chief Engineer, one Deputy Chief Engineer, seven Executive Engineers, sixteen Assistant and Sub-Engineers, forty-eight Upper Subordinates and twenty-two Lower Subordinates and one Manager in the Chief Engineer's Office. The effect of the reorganisation was the reduction of one Deputy Chief Engineer, two Executive Engineers, two Assistant and Sub-Engineers, fifteen Upper Subordinates, one Lower Subordinate and one Manager. As the House can very well see, two full Divisions, with all their staff, were abolished and the work of these two Divisions was added on to other Divisions. The work of the Southern Division was added on to the Nagercoil Division, and the saving effected was about Rs. 37,000 in the executive establishment alone. The ministerial staff, however, was increased at that time. The net result of the reorganisation of 1098 was a reduction of the executive staff and an increase of ministerial staff. Now we find that the reduction of the executive staff was very ill-advised. There is a great deal of lack of supervision. It is often the complaint in this House that works provided for in the budget are not carried out

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. L. H. Jacob.]

and that irrigation works are not attended to. I can assure you that it is due to want of staff to supervise and execute works. Sir P. Rajagopalachariar stated that the ratio of 13 to 100, for staff, or even 16 to 100, was too low for good work. What we saved in establishment charges was probably being lost several times over by bad work owing to inadequate supervision. Sir P. Rajagopalachariar said that an expenditure of 20 per cent. of the outlay on establishment cannot be considered excessive.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): In view of the fact that the Southern Division was abolished, may I know whether, under the proposed scheme, the minor irrigation works in the Nagercoil Division will be entrusted to the proposed new Division?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I will come to that.

However, the reduced executive staff was carrying on heavy work from 1098 to 1108, when further reduction of staff was made on account of financial stringency. Three Sub-Divisions and six Sections and all their staff were abolished.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I do not want to interrupt the member. But, I would suggest that the speech may be confined to the statement of the necessary arguments and facts especially considering the limitations of time. I may just inform Mr. Jacob that he has about 6 minutes more, and suggest to him that, if the specific points raised by the non-official members are answered, that will be conducive to proper discussion.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I am trying to explain that, Sir. Our expenditure on works comes to nearly 5 lakhs of rupees, in each of the existing Divisions and I would ask the members whether this work also could be added on to any of these Divisions. There are at present five territorial divisions in the State.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): We cannot hear the member and we are not able to follow him. The one point for which alone we want answer from the Chief Engineer is whether he is prepared to accept our proposal for the formation of a Committee or Board?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Please wait till he finishes his speech.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): That is the one point that has been raised.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I heard other points also being raised.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): When was such a proposal made, Sir?

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): Mr. Velayudhan Pillai's cut motion wants a Board of Irrigation to be constituted. Does the Chief Engineer accept it?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): That question will be considered.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. EDAVANATT S. PADMANABHA MENON (*Shertala I*): We want an assurance from the Chief Engineer that the Board will be constituted.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I cannot give an assurance just now.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): May I know whether there is any objection to the Kodayar Project also being brought under the proposed new Division?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): For the present, at any rate, we want to keep the Kodayar Project separate. Mr. Sivatanu Pillai raised the question of minor irrigation works under the Kodayar Project. It is not at all the intention of Government to give up the minor irrigation works there. They will be under the Nagercoil Executive Engineer —

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I ask whether the transfer of minor irrigation works from the Nagercoil Executive Engineer will not facilitate better work?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I do not think so.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): Have the Government any idea of reinstating the Sub-Division in the south which they recently abolished?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): No, not at present.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): May I know whether the sum of Rs. 42,000, referred to by the Chief Engineer, represents the total cost on account of the salaries of the establishment of the proposed Division, or is it an additional grant that is required?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): That is for the salaries of the establishment of the new Division to be formed, for the rest of the year.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): The entire Division from the Executive Engineer down to the staff?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Yes.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): In that case, may I ask whether the Chief Engineer has taken into account, in preparing this demand, the existence of supernumerary officers in the department?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): That will be looked into when the new Division is actually formed.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): As a measure of retrenchment, some posts were reduced, and, the incumbents being permanent hands, were not sent away and were retained as supernumeraries. These unwanted officers are being paid by Government even now. I want to know whether the fact that they are available has been taken into account in preparing this supplementary demand.

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): I am sorry I cannot agree that they are unwanted officers.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*) : If they are wanted, why were they declared supernumeraries?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*) : They became super. numeraries on account of the recent reorganisation.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) Under the T. S. R., have not the supernumeraries to be absorbed first?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Yes.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You press your motion, Mr. Velayudhan Pillai?

MR. C. V. KUNJURAMAN (*Nominated*) : ഈ ഡിമാൻഡ്മുഴുവൻവോ ട്ടിനിട്ടുകയാണൊ അതല്ല ഒരു രൂപാ കറയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഉപക്ഷേപ മാത്രം വോട്ടിനിട്ടുകയാണോ?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : മിസ്റ്റർ വേലായുധൻപിള്ളയുടെ ഉപക്ഷേ പമാണ് ഇപ്പോൾ വോട്ടിനിടുന്നത്.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I think it is the token motion to reduce Re. 1 that is to be voted upon now?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Yes,

The motion was put to vote and carried.

MR. A. S DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I demand a poll.

A poll was taken and the House divided as follows:

AYES—24.

1	Mr. P. Chidambaram Pillai.	13	Mr. M. K. Madhavan Pillai.
2	,, A. S. Damodaran Asan.	14	,, K. Mahomed.
3	,, A. Easwara Pillai (*Kalkulam II*)	15	Srimati T. Narayani Amma
4	,, A. Easvara Pillai (*Kottarakara*)	16	Mr. S. Nilakanta Pillai.
5	,, K. R. Elenkath.	17	,, K. Padmanabhan.
6	Miss Hepzibah Gnanasikamony	18	,, Edavanatt S. Padmanabha Menon.
7	Mr. M. Mahomed Haneef	19	,, Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai.
8	,, Pottayil S. Krishna Panickar.	20	,, V. Ramakrishna Panickar.
9	,, N. K. Krishna Pillai.	21	,, K. Sankaran,
10	,, T. Krishna Pillai.	22	,, A. Thanu Pillai.
11	,, K. Kunjukrishna Pillai.	23	,, V. K. Velappan Nair.
12	,, K. Madhavan	24	,, T. P. Velayudhan Pillai.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NOES—19.

1	Mr. N. Abdur Rahiman Sahib.	12	Mr. N. K. Padmanabha Pillai
2.	,, C. V. Chandrasekharan.	13	,, Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai.
3	,, S. Chattanatha Karayalar.	14	,, T. P. Ramasubha Aiyar.
4	,, Antony George.	15	,, R. Sambasiva Aiyar.
5	,, K. George.	16	,, R. Sivasubrahmanya Nadar.
6	,, L. H. Jacob.	17	,, M. Sivatanu Pillai.
7	Rao Sahib Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai.	18	,, R. M. Statham.
8	Mr. M. N. Nair.	19	,, T. C. Thommen.
9	,, B. Narayana Pillai.		
10	,, G. Nilakantan.		
11	,, R. Nilakanta Pillai.		

NEUTRALS—19

1	Mr. K. C. Abraham.	11	,, K. P. Krishna Menon.
2	,, T. K. Alexander.	12	,, E. V. Krishna Pillai.
3	,, V. T. Chacko.	13	,, C. V. Kunjuraman.
4	,, S. J. Nair.	14	,, E. K. Kunjuraman.
5	,, M. K. Janardana Kamath.	15	,, K. M. Kuriakose.
6	,, T. S. Jayantan Namboo-tiri	16	,, P. C. Narayanan Bhatta-tiripad.
7	,, N. John Joseph.	17	,, P. K. Narayana Pillai.
8	,, T. C. Joseph.	18	,, P. K. Thomas.
9	,, T. T. Kesavan Sastri.	19	,, N. E. Varughese.
10	,, K M. Krishnan		

The motion was declared carried.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : We now proceed to the discussion of the main demand.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) : I support the motion before the House. I too wanted to suggest that an endeavour should be made (*Louder, please*) whether a diversion could not be made from the existing staff for this proposed new Division. But, after hearing the official member, we have to take it that such diversion is not possible. This question of abolishing a portion of the permanent staff of the P. W. D. was considered by the Retrenchment Committee, and they made certain proposals. Government have considered those proposals and have given effect to some reduction in the staff. Therefore, I do not think we can now press for further reduction from the normal P. W. D. staff.

I take it that, when the new Division is formed, the supernumeraries in the department as also the temporary officers in the several Sections for irrigation, will go into the new Division and that the temporary staff of the Irrigation Sections will not be separately seen.

In this connection, I would say one thing. There was a move some years ago for detailed rules being framed under Section 32 of the Irrigation Regulation for constituting Irrigation Boards in several

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. P. Ramasubba Aiyar.]

suitable areas in the State. Draft Rules were framed and they were circulated to the Division Peishkars.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I rise to a point of order. He is discussing the policy again and a further discussion of the policy does not appear to be permissible.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You should not raise general questions of policy, Mr. Ramasubba Aiyar.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): What is the motion now before the House?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Members cannot be reminded what motion is before the House from time to time.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I want to know whether the motion before the House now is for one lakh of rupees or a lakh of rupees *minus* one rupee.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The fact that a cut for one rupee has been made does not mean that the original motion should be put to vote. The Council's opinion certainly goes a great way, but there is another party concerned, namely the Government. The Government may, if so advised, accept the reduction. So that question need not be raised now. Mr. Ramasubba Aiyar may proceed.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*): I only wanted to press on the attention of Government the need for considering the question again and passing rules for the formation of Irrigation Boards in suitable areas. These Local Boards will represent the needs of the people to the irrigation officers and work in co-operation with them.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I want to clear a difficulty. This Assembly has reduced the amount by one rupee and I wish to know what is the motion which has to be put to the vote of the House now. Is it a motion for a lakh of rupees or for Rs. 99,999?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I see that.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): When the motion is put to vote, it will be for a lakh of rupees *minus* one rupee.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The motion is for the original amount *minus* one rupee. It is not the original motion in its entirety.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): I move that the question be now put.

The closure motion was put and declared carried.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Does the official member propose to reply?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): No, Sir.

The demand for Rs. 1 lakh, *minus* Re 1 was put to the vote of the House and carried, and the grant was made.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 4,033 under 'Administration of Justice'. This grant is required on two distinct items One

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly